

REMARKS

The Office Action dated January 20, 2006, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments and the following remarks are being submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Entry of Response Proper

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. §1.116 since this Amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance for reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise any new issue regarding further search and/or consideration since the Amendment clarifies and amplifies issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) does not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally-rejected claims; and (d) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the Amendment is thus respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Thus, Claims 1-7 are currently pending in the application and are subject to examination. Applicants submit that the amendments to Claims 1 and 7 are fully supported in the original specification, for example, at least at page 22, lines 2 to 9. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that no new matter is presented herein.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1, 2, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 5,060,272). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, sets forth an audio signal processing apparatus, comprising signal processing means for processing audio signals fed from outside equipment,

operating means for setting parameters in order for the signal processing means to process the audio signals, storing means for storing a sequential series of past operations that can be read-out successively, the past operations being associated with a series of movements of the operating means, designating means capable of automatically effecting a desired treatment in accordance with the past operation data stored in the storing means, and control means for setting parameters in order for the signal processing means to process the audio signals in accordance with the desired treatment, when the designating means is operated.

Claim 7, as amended, recites an audio signal processing apparatus, comprising a signal processor which processes audio signals fed from outside equipment, an operating device which sets parameters in order for the signal processor to process the audio signals, a memory device for storing a sequential series of past operations that can be read-out successively, the past operations being associated with a series of movements of the operating device, a designating device capable of automatically effecting a desired treatment in accordance with the past operation data stored in the storing device, and a controller which sets parameters in order for the signal processor to process the audio signals in accordance with the desired treatment when the designating device is operated.

Applicants submit that the applied art of record fails to disclose or suggest all the elements of the claimed invention. Specifically, the applied art of record fails to disclose or suggest "storing means for storing a sequential series of past operations that can be read-out successively," as set forth in Claim 1, and "a memory device for storing a

sequential series of past operations that can be read-out successively,” as set forth in Claim 7.

Suzuki merely describes a memory 30 that only stores the last operation position information of each fader operation, i.e., data that is only associated with one time point and stored in memory 30 (see Suzuki, col. 4, lines 1-10 and 45-47). As such, Suzuki fails to teach storing a sequential series of past operations that can be read out successively, as set forth in independent Claims 1 and 7. As a result, Suzuki fails to effect an automatic operation based on a sequential series of past operation data.

To qualify as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single prior art reference must teach, i.e., identically describe, each feature of a rejected claim. As explained above, Suzuki fails to teach or suggest each and every feature of Claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 7 are not anticipated by or rendered obvious in view of Suzuki. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 7 are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. As such, Applicants submit that Claim 2 is allowable over the cited prior art for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki as applied to Claim 1 in view of Silfvast et al. (WO 93/03549, hereinafter “Silfvast ‘549”). Claims 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki/Silfvast ‘549 as applied to Claim 3 above, and further in view of Silfvast et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 6,438,241, hereinafter "Silfvast '241"). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

Claims 2-6 depend from Claim 1, incorporating by reference all the features set forth therein. With respect to Claim 3, the Office Action applies Silfvast '549 for teaching an apparatus used to process audio signals and return faders and a rotary knob to a stored position. With respect to Claim 4, the Office Action applies Silfvast '241 for teaching a display such as an array of lights wherein a sensor is coupled with the rotor, which senses its relative rotation wherein the display of lights is in response to the sensor to indicate a value of a parameter in order to display indicating values by angular position. Applicants note that both Silfvast '549 and Silfvast '241, alone or in any combination thereof, fail to address or otherwise overcome the above-described deficiencies of Suzuki.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 3-6 are allowable for at least the same reasons independent Claim 1 is allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of Claims 1-7, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact

Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below to schedule a personal or telephone interview to discuss any remaining issues.

In the event that this paper is not considered to be timely filed, an appropriate extension of time is requested. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account Number 01-2300, referencing **Docket Number 107156-09039**.

Respectfully submitted,

Arent Fox PLLC



Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration Number 44,275

Customer Number 004372
ARENT FOX PLLC
1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW
Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: 202-857-6000
Fax: 202-857-6395

MO/SCO:vmh